DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 435 UD 012 477

AUTHOR Ringler, Leonore; Pedhazur, Elazar
TITLE An Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools. New York City Title I Project.
INSTITUTION New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 71
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Compensatory Education Programs; *Corrective Reading; Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Diagnosis; Federal Programs; Parent Participation; Parochial Schools; *Private Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Reading Tests
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program; ESEA Title I Programs; *New York

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the corrective reading services for disadvantaged pupils in non-public schools who are deficient in reading, instituted by the New York City Board of Education under Title I, 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act. The program is organized so that small groups of pupils meet with the Title I Reading Teachers to receive specialized instruction based on a diagnosis of reading disabilities. The major objectives of the program are: (1) to increase proficiency in reading; (2) to increase general achievement and stimulate motivation for school work by improving reading skills; (3) to note the effect of an experimental five-day a week reading program on reading achievement as compared to the regular two-day a week program; and, (4) to make the corrective reading work more effective by reinforcement of reading work in the regular classroom and by encouraging parents to participate in the pupils' reading program. Evaluation procedures included site visits to a stratified sample of 28 schools selected from the 158 participating schools; an analysis of reading test scores for a random sample of 400 elementary school pupils and 116 secondary school pupils; and, an analysis of responses by the professional staff, parents, and pupils to detailed questionnaires and rating scales designed to assess their perceptions and reactions to the program. (For a related document see ED 058 362, April 1972.) (Author/JM)

ED 064435

Function No. 910642

An Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools

NEW YORK CITY TITLE 1 PROJECT

PROJECT CO-DIRECTORS
Professor Leonore Ringler
Professor Elazar Pedhazur

CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH
AND SCHOOL SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

August 1971

New York City Title 1 Project

ED 064435

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF THE CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

NEW YORK CITY TITLE I PROJECT

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1970-71 school year.

Project Co-Directors:

Professor Leonore Ringler
Professor Elazar Pedhazur

CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH AND SCHOOL SERVICES
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

August, 1971

UD 012477

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

August 31, 1971

Dr. Samuel D. McClelland
Acting Director
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. McClelland:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated March 1, 1971 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Field Research and School Services, I am pleased to submit three hundred copies of the final evaluation report, Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under Title I, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Spinner

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

AS:cm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The co-directors of this project wish to express their appreciation to the following individuals whose assistance was invaluable. Graduate assistants, Isaac Balogun, Cecelia Hirsh, Dena Isaacson, Helen Leonard, and Penelope Pinson who carried out the field observations and collected the data for this report. Special thanks to Jeanette Syracuse for undertaking the arduous task of mailing questionnaires and preparing the data for analysis, and to Liora Schmelkin for her work in data coding and punching.

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the Title I staff in all aspects of this evaluation. Without the cooperation of the corrective reading teachers, field supervisors, and project coordinator this report would not have been possible.

Finally, we would like to thank the liaison officers, teachers, principals, and pupils of the non-public schools for their continued support and cooperation.

L. R.
E. P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	2
EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	2
EVALUATION PROCEDURES	2
IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM	5
PUPIL EVALUATION	10
Evaluation of Pupils' Gains	10
Evaluation by Classroom Teacher	12
Self-Evaluation by Secondary School Pupils	14
EVALUATION OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING	16
STAFF EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM	19
Reading Teachers	19
Classroom Teachers	23
Principals	25
Project Coordinator and Field Supervisors	28
PARENTS' REACTIONS TO PROGRAM	30
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
APPENDIX A Observer Check List	37
APPENDIX B Pupil Evaluation Form	41
APPENDIX C Pupil Questionnaire	43
APPENDIX D Reading Teacher In-Service Training Questionnaire	45
APPENDIX E Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire	49
APPENDIX F Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire	53
APPENDIX G Principal Evaluation Questionnaire	55
APPENDIX H Reading Supervisor Interview Form	57
APPENDIX I Parent Letter and Questionnaire	61

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Schools Selected for Site Visit by District and Code	3
2.	Observer Check List	6, 7
3.	Means and Standard Deviations – Observers' Ratings	7
4.	Intercorrelation Matrix for Seven Major Areas	9
5.	Test of Significance of Gains in Reading	11
6.	Classroom Teachers' Evaluation of Pupils	13
7.	Intercorrelation Matrix of Classroom Teachers' Evaluation of Pupils	13
8.	Background Characteristics of Pupils – Grades 7-8	14
9.	Pupil Questionnaire – Grades 7-8	15
10.	In-Service Training Sessions – Attendance and General Impressions	17
11.	Evaluation of Training Sessions – Corrective Reading Teachers	18
12.	Evaluation of Program – Corrective Reading Teachers	20
13.	Participation and General Impressions – Corrective Reading Teachers	22
14.	Evaluation of Program – Classroom Teachers	23
15.	Pupil Participation and General Impressions – Classroom Teachers	24
16.	Evaluation of Program – Principals	26
17.	General Impression and Interest – Principals	26
18.	Evaluation of Program – Supervisors and Project Coordinator	29
19.	Parents' Responses	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New York City Board of Education under Title I ESEA has instituted corrective reading services for disadvantaged pupils in non-public schools who are deficient in reading. The program is organized so that small groups of pupils meet with the Title I Reading Teachers to receive specialized instruction based on a diagnosis of reading disabilities. This program is in its fifth full year of operation.

The major objectives of the program are (1) to increase proficiency in reading; (2) to increase general achievement and stimulate motivation for school work by improving reading skills; (3) to note the effect of an experimental five-day a week reading program on reading achievement as compared to the regular two-day a week program; (4) to make the corrective reading work more effective by reinforcement of reading work in the regular classroom and by encouraging parents to participate in the pupils' reading program.

Formal evaluation of the 1970-71 school year program began in early January. The evaluation focused on the degree to which the objectives noted above were met. Evaluation procedures included site visits to a stratified sample of 28 schools selected from the 158 participating schools; an analysis of reading test scores for a random sample of 400 elementary school pupils and 116 secondary school pupils; and an analysis of responses by the professional staff, parents and pupils to detailed questionnaires and rating scales designed to assess their perceptions and reactions to the program.

This final report includes an evaluation of the project's effectiveness in increasing reading achievement, an evaluation of the in-service training as perceived by the reading teachers, and an evaluation of the program by the professional staff, the parents, and the pupils who participated in the program. This report is restricted to the operations of the program during the 1970-71 school year.

Findings

Analysis of the data collected yielded the following findings:

1. Observation of the program in operation in a stratified sample of 28 schools indicated that the program was implemented as outlined in the project proposal. Observers noted that the program at both the elementary and secondary levels was functioning satisfactorily.

2. Mean ratings of the 28 schools in respect to their physical facilities, materials, evaluation, planning, teaching procedures, teacher behavior, and pupil participation were all above average. Physical facilities showed the greatest variability across schools and the lowest correlations with the other six aspects rated.

3. Analysis of reading test scores indicated meaningful and substantial gains in the areas under study. In each instance the mean gains exceeded one standard deviation. It is to be noted, however, that in all instances the classes were quite deficient in reading and therefore despite the impressive gains all grades tested are still below the norm. This, of course, indicates a need for further remediation in order to close the gap and enable the students to derive greater benefits from their educational experience.

4. Ratings by the classroom teachers of their pupils who attended the reading program indicated "average improvement" in reading ability, other school subjects, study habits, outside assignments, and attitude toward school. There was, however, a good deal of variability in improvement among students.

5. Self-evaluation by secondary school pupils showed positive reactions to the program. A relatively large number (59 percent) indicated that they wished to participate in a similar program next year.

6. Reading teachers (75 percent of respondents) reported that the in-service training they received was sufficient. The content covered during the training sessions was considered relevant to their work as corrective reading teachers.

7. Principals and classroom teachers in the non-public schools favorably evaluated the program. The only item rated below average was the involvement of parents. An overwhelming majority of the teachers (78 percent) and the principals (92 percent) expressed interest in participating in a similar program next year.

8. The Title I staff including the project coordinator, field supervisors, and corrective reading teachers reported positive reactions to the various aspects of the program. With the exception of parental involvement all aspects of the program were rated above average by the reading teachers.

9. Parents' responses indicated that while there was little involvement on their part, at least as far as communication with school personnel, the overwhelming majority (81 percent) found the program useful and wanted its continuation.

Recommendations

In conclusion, on the basis of site observations, analysis of reading test data, reactions of the professional staff, parents, and pupils and additional data cited in the body of the report, the evaluators consider the corrective reading program effective in accomplishing its major goals. It is, therefore, recommended that the corrective reading services for disadvantaged pupils in non-public schools be recycled.

Some recommendations which might increase the effectiveness of the program follow:

1. Urge non-public school principals to upgrade those physical facilities that are inadequate.
2. Set up a central depository for reading materials to facilitate their distribution and to enable the reading teachers to view and select materials geared to their pupils' needs.
3. Encourage the use of teacher-made materials by conducting teacher workshops in which the reading teachers would prepare and share these materials.
4. Increase the number of informal small group meeting for in-service training.
5. Consider involving the reading teachers in the planning and implementation of the training sessions.
6. Include guest lecturers who are reading specialists to enrich the in-service training program.
7. Continue to stress individual diagnosis of errors and an instructional program geared to correct the deficiencies of each pupil.
8. Increase, where possible, communication between the classroom teacher and the reading teacher.
9. Continue to work in the area of parental involvement, particularly in the setting up of parent workshops.
10. Study the possibility of using a test instrument other than the Metropolitan Reading Test to assess pupil progress.

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Program Description

The New York City Board of Education under Title I ESEA has instituted corrective reading services for disadvantaged pupils in the non-public schools who are deficient in reading. This program is in its fifth full year of operation. Under the program the New York City Board of Education recruits, trains, and assigns licensed teachers to the non-public schools for the purpose of improving the reading ability of those children who have reading problems.

The corrective reading program is organized so that small groups of pupils meet with the Title I Reading Teachers to receive specialized instruction based on a diagnosis of reading disabilities. In the early elementary grades, beginning-to-read skills and decoding are emphasized. In the upper elementary grades, comprehension and study skills are added to decoding skills. Word attack skills are emphasized for all pupils reading on primary level regardless of grade placement. In addition, independent study habits are stressed as preparation for academic work in the secondary school. In the secondary school, the emphasis is on establishing competency in content areas, organization of material, and the ability to handle homework assignments. Instruction in advanced comprehension and vocabulary skills is continued at this level.

During the 1970-71 school year 8,766 students in 158 non-public schools in impacted poverty neighborhoods received corrective reading services. An additional 4,526 pupils remained on a waiting list. Thirty-nine regular teachers, four per diem teachers serving on a five day a week basis and 100 part-time teachers were involved in the program. A Reading Coordinator designated by the Board of Education is responsible for coordinating and supervising the program. In addition, eight field supervisors fulfilling 6 allotted positions were responsible for the on-going supervision and training of the Title I Corrective Reading teachers.

Children in grades two through twelve who were more than one standard deviation below the norm on a standardized reading test were recommended for corrective reading service by the non-public school principal. The screening of applicants was handled by the Title I Corrective Reading teachers.

Program Objectives

The major objectives of the program are (1) to increase proficiency in reading; (2) to note the effect of an experimental five-day week reading program on reading achievement as compared to the regular two-day a week program; (3) to increase general achievement and stimulate motivation for school work by improving reading skills; (4) to make the corrective reading work more effective by encouraging reinforcement of reading work in the regular classroom and by encouraging parents to participate in the pupils' reading program.

Evaluation Objectives

The evaluation focused on the degree to which the objectives noted above were met. The major evaluation objectives were:

1. To describe and evaluate the implementation of the program.
2. To determine to what extent the program has increased proficiency in reading.
3. To compare the reading achievement of an experimental reading group meeting five times a week with a conventional group meeting twice a week.
4. To note the effect of the corrective reading program on the general achievement of the pupils and their motivation for school work.
5. To determine the effectiveness of the program as perceived by the reading teachers, classroom teachers, school principals, and reading supervisors.
6. To assess the degree of parental involvement in the program.
7. To evaluate the in-service training program for the corrective reading teachers.

Formal evaluation of the 1970-71 school year program began in early January with a series of site visits. The evaluation was concluded at the end of the Spring semester in June 1971. This final report is restricted to the operations of the program during the 1970-71 school year. It includes an evaluation of the project's implementation, an assessment of the project's effectiveness in increasing reading proficiency, an evaluation of the in-service training as perceived by the reading teachers, and an evaluation of the program by the professional staff, the parents, and the pupils who participated in the program.

Evaluation Procedures

To meet the stated evaluation objectives, specific procedures were developed by the co-directors of the evaluation project. In order to note the implementation of the program a stratified sample of 28 schools proportionally representing the schools in each code group, was selected for site visits. For a breakdown of the schools involved in the site visits see Table 1.

TABLE 1

Schools Selected for Site Visits by District and Code
N = 28

Code	Frequency	Districts
1	12	1(3)[a], 2(4), 4(2), 6(2), 7(1)
2	9	13(3), 14(1), 15(1), 19(3), 29(1)
3	3	1(1), 14(1), 20(1)
4	2	8(1), 24(1)
5	1	17(1)
6	1	15(1)

[a]Number in parentheses refers to number of schools selected in the district.

The six codes noted in Table 1 designate the affiliation of the non-public school system as follows:

Code 1 – Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of New York
Code 2 – Catholic Schools, Diocese of Brooklyn
Code 3 – Hebrew Day Schools
Code 4 – Greek Orthodox Schools
Code 5 – Lutheran Schools
Code 6 – Episcopal Schools

In addition to the six codes listed above, there is a Code 7 referring to Ukranian Catholic Schools. The selection procedure did not include any Code 7 school due to the fact that the one school in that code is not yet receiving corrective reading services.

For the site visits a team of five observers visited the various schools and observed the work of the Title I reading teacher with different groups of pupils. The observers used an Observer Check List to record the conditions noted in the on-going program. In addition, the observers rated each aspect of the program on a five-point scale ranging from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory." The reading programs in the 28 schools were thus rated in respect to their physical facilities, materials, pupil evaluation, planning, teaching procedures, and the functioning of the teachers and pupils in the program.

As one of the major objectives of the program was to increase pupils' proficiency in reading and general achievement, and to stimulate motivation for school work, several aspects of pupil evaluation were considered. To note the effect of the corrective reading program on the general achievement of pupils and their motivation for school work, a Pupil Evaluation Form was developed for use by the classroom teacher. Standardized test scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test and the Iowa Silent Reading Test were obtained from the Title I project coordinator and were analyzed to determined pupils' increased proficiency in reading. In addition, a simple Pupil Questionnaire was prepared to note the attitude of the secondary school pupils to the corrective reading program.

Detailed questionnaires and rating scales were prepared to assess the perceptions and reactions of all personnel connected with the project. Instruments designed for this aspect of the evaluation are as follows: Corrective Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire, Corrective Reading Teacher In-Service Training Questionnaire, Principal Evaluation Questionnaire, Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire, Field Supervisor Interview Form, and Parent Questionnaire. Copies of all instruments designed for this evaluation are included in the appendices to this report.

Following the construction of the instruments noted above and their approval by the Title I standing committee of the non-public schools, one of the project directors conducted a training session for the five research assistants to be employed in the site visits. The items on the Observer Check List were interpreted in detail so as to ensure standard procedures and applications during the classroom observations. Site visits to the selected sample of non-public schools began on January 7, 1971, and continued through May 17, 1971.

Questionnaires and explanatory covering letters were mailed to corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, principals, and parents during the month of May, 1971. The Pupil Evaluation Form was filled out by the classroom teacher during May, 1971, and the Pupil Questionnaire (Grades 7 – 8) was administered by the evaluation team and the

corrective reading teachers during the first two weeks in May. The Title I field supervisors and Title I project coordinator were interviewed by the evaluation project co-director during the third week of June, 1971. The achievement test data were obtained from the Board of Education at the end of June, 1971.

A detailed analysis of data collected is presented below in the following order: Implementation of program as determined by site visits; pupil evaluation data; corrective reading teachers' evaluation of in-service training; evaluation of on-going program by corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, principals, and field supervisors; and finally, reactions of parents.

Implementation of Program

As previously noted a team of five trained observers noted the implementation of the program through scheduled site visits. Each of the 28 schools was scheduled for three site visits. The total number of groups observed in each school ranged from five to nine. Altogether the research assistants observed 201 individual classes. It is to be noted that in those schools which received the minimum number of observations, the reading services were generally limited to one day a week and were scheduled after the regular school day.

During each visit various aspects of the program were observed and rated on a five-point scale. Since the physical facilities employed were the same throughout the school year, only the overall mean rating of this aspect of the program will be reported. As to the remaining activities, the frequency of each of them observed during the 201 site visits is reported. This is followed by the overall mean ratings of the major areas of the program, and the intercorrelations among these areas.

A summary of the observations as recorded in the Observers Check List is reported in Table 2.

The means and the standard deviations of the ratings for the seven major areas are reported in Table 3. As can be observed from Table 3, all areas were rated above average. The mean ratings ranged from 3.41 for Physical Facilities, to 4.06 for Teacher Behavior.

TABLE 2

OBSERVER CHECK LIST
NUMBER OF VISITS = 201

		Frequency	Percent
B.	**Materials**		
1.	Variety of commercial materials being used.		
	a. Workbooks	178	89
	b. Trade books	198	99
	c. Magazines	73	36
	d. Newspapers	147	73
	e. Content-area materials	96	48
	f. Other	104	52
2.	Teacher-made Materials	33	16
3.	Audio-visual aids	91	45
4.	Interest level appropriate to age and maturity of pupils	194	97
5.	Levels of materials suitable for reading ability of pupils	193	96
6.	Differentiation between instructional level and independent level materials	138	69
7.	Attractive in appearance	164	82
8.	Sufficient quantity	149	74
C.	**Evaluation**		
1.	Use of Informal Reading Inventory	102	51
2.	Use of Gray Oral Reading Test	197	98
3.	Standardized Reading Test upon admission to program	184	92
4.	Standardized Reading Test at end of school year	193	96
5.	On-going informal evaluation of errors in word recognition	185	92
6.	On-going diagnosis of errors in comprehension	178	89
7.	Evaluation of deficiencies in study skills	103	51
D.	**Planning**		
1.	Evidence of planned sequence in skill development	171	85
2.	Planning of skill lessons based on on-going diagnosis of deficiencies	174	87
3.	Evidence of planned varied activities for individual and small group needs	153	76
4.	Application materials and assignments differentiated for individual and group needs	140	70

		Frequency	Percent
E.	**Teaching Procedures**		
1.	Background, readiness, or concept building where appropriate to lesson	176	88
2.	Specific skill teaching in		
	a. work recognition	154	77
	b. comprehension	154	77
	c. study skills	56	28
3.	Appropriate application following development of a specific skill	154	77
4.	Questions differentiated to include various types of meanings – literal, interpretation, critical evaluation	133	66
5.	Grouping of pupils (small groups or individual) for special needs	148	74
6.	Procedures appropriate to maturity and ability of pupils	187	93
7.	Use of class time – pacing, variety of activities	181	90
8.	Integration of reading with content areas	33	16
F.	**Teacher Behavior**		
1.	Appears enthusiastic	168	84
2.	Establishes a good rapport with pupils (relaxed, informal, confident)	185	92
3.	Encourages all pupils to participate	193	96
4.	Instills confidence in pupils – uses positive reinforcement	188	94
G.	**Pupil Participation**		
1.	Arrive promptly for reading instruction	172	86
2.	Actively respond during reading period	192	96
3.	Interact with each other	161	80
4.	Show interest in independent reading	176	88

TABLE 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OBSERVERS' RATINGS OF SEVEN MAJOR AREAS

	Area	Mean	SD	N[a]
A.	Physical Facilities	3.41	1.04	196
B.	Materials	3.72	.88	195
C.	Evaluation	3.82	.79	198
D.	Planning	3.62	.85	199
E.	Teaching Procedures	3.54	.81	199
F.	Teacher Behavior	4.06	.83	199
G.	Pupil Participation	4.03	.75	198

[a]Number of ratings.

Observer comments in each of the seven areas reported in Tables 2 and 3 indicated a good deal of variability across the 28 selected schools. Physical Facilities, which were constant throughout the year were rated from poor to excellent. However, even in those schools with inadequate physical space, the reading teachers, on the whole, tended to make good use of the available space.

Materials provided for the program were very satisfactory. The teachers were observed using a great variety of commercial materials. The use of teacher-made materials was less evident (16 percent) in the groups observed. The extensive use of trade books was noted in all of the 28 schools.

The use of the Informal Reading Test for pupil evaluation was not mandated this year. The Gray Oral Reading Test was substituted and this would account for the relatively low frequency (102 – 51 percent) on item C-1. The observation of evaluation of deficiencies in study skills (item C-7) yielded a frequency of 103 (51 percent). This is to be considered high as the majority of the schools selected for the site visits were elementary level and the pupils deficient in reading ability would be concentrating on word recognition and comprehension skills rather than study skills. This same reasoning would account for the low percentages recorded under Teaching Procedures for item 2-C (28 percent) and item 8 (16 percent), skill teaching in study skills and integration of reading with content areas, respectively. The emphasis on study skills and the use of content area materials would generally be confined to the upper elementary grades and the secondary school. All other items under Planning and Teaching Procedures were observed a minimum of 133 times (66 percent).

The areas of Teacher Behavior and Pupil Participation received the highest mean ratings. This observation is also borne out in Table 2. Here the frequencies for these two areas are consistently high. The observers commented that generally the reading teachers were most enthusiastic about their work and that this was reflected in the attitude of the pupils.

In general, the observers perceived the program as operating well and as being implemented in accordance with the project proposal.

The intercorrelation matrix for the seven areas is reported in Table 4.

TABLE 4

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR SEVEN MAJOR AREAS RATED BY OBSERVERS

AREA	B	C	D	E	F	G
A. Physical Facilities	.41 (194)	.17 (195)	.20 (195)	.17 (195)	.19 (195)	.16 (194)
B. Materials	–	.44 (193)	.38 (193)	.26 (193)	.27 (194)	.39 (193)
C. Evaluation		–	.59 (197)	.44 (197)	.37 (197)	.40 (196)
D. Planning			–	.65 (198)	.40 (197)	.37 (196)
E. Teaching Procedures				–	.51 (197)	.42 (196)
F. Teacher Behavior					–	.68 (198)
G. Pupil Participation						–

Interestingly, the highest correlation (.68) is the one between Teacher Behavior and Pupil Participation. Teachers who were rated high had students whose participation was rated high. While one should not infer casuality on the basis of a correlation, it seems reasonable to assume the enthusiastic teachers were better able to motivate their students. The correlation between Planning and Teaching Procedures (.65) is not surprising. Teachers who are considered high on planning tend to employ better Teaching Procedures. The same reasoning applies also to the relatively high correlation (.59) between Evaluation and Planning, and to the correlation between Teaching Procedures and Teaching Behavior (.51). In general, good performance in one area tends to be associated with good performance in the other areas. An interesting exception can be noted in regard to Physical Facilities. Except for one moderate correlation (.41) between Physical Facilities and Materials, all the variables have low correlations with Physical Facilities (the correlations range from .61 to .20). Apparently, the quality of the facility does not have much bearing on the overall effectiveness of the program. This is not to say that physical facilities are not important. It is possible, that, despite the variations among them, most facilities were sufficiently adequate for the purpose of the program, and, therefore, played a lesser role when related to the other variables. An alternative explanation may be that a good teacher is able to overcome shortcomings in physical facilities and still offer a good program.

Pupil Evaluation

One of the major objectives of the program was to increase pupils' proficiency in reading and general achievement, and to stimulate motivation for school work. With this in mind, several aspects were evaluated.

To assess to what extent the corrective reading program increased pupils' proficiency in reading, a random sample of pre-test and post-test scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test and Iowa Silent Reading Test were analyzed. Although it was possible to note the rate of growth in reading ability as measured by the above tests, the design did not permit a comparison of pupils who received corrective reading services with a comparative control group. Comparable data for pupils not in the reading program were not available to the evaluation team. In addition, test data of pupils attending corrective reading five days a week were compared with test data of pupils attending twice a week.

Additional data were collected in the twenty-eight schools involved in the site visits. A Pupil Evaluation Form was filled out by the classroom teacher for randomly selected pupils who attended corrective reading classes on a regular basis. The questionnaire asked for assessment of general achievement, motivation for school work, and attitude toward school. Secondary school pupils (Grades 7 – 8) in the twenty-eight schools responded to a simple questionnaire designed to determine their attitude toward the special reading services that they were receiving.

Evaluation of Pupils' Gains

As indicated earlier, no control group was available for the purpose of comparisons of gains in reading. The procedure adopted, therefore, was as follows: (1) Assess the gains in comparison to what one would normally expect retarded readers to gain in a comparable period of time without taking part in a special remedial program: and (2) Test of significance of mean gains.

It was further decided that the evaluation of gains will be performed only for students whose remedial work in the program started in the beginning of the 1970-71 school year. One thousand two hundred and forty-four such students were identified. A random sample of 400 students was selected for the purpose of the analysis. For students in grades 2 through 6, initial and final scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Word Knowledge and paragraph Meaning were available. In view of the fact that for grade 7 and 8 a relatively small sample was available, it was decided not to include their scores in the analysis.

TABLE 5

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE OF GAINS IN READING

		Word Knowledge						Paragraph Meaning					
Grade	N	Mean Pre-Test	SD Pre	Mean Post-Test	SD Pre	Gain	t^a Ratio	Mean Pre-Test	SD Pre	Mean Post-Test	SD Post	Gain	t^a Ratio
2	46	1.64	.36	2.19	.51	.55	7.27	1.44	.39	2.28	.60	.84	11.19
3	158	1.97	.35	2.63	.51	.66	18.22	1.87	.32	2.73	.64	.86	18.27
4	93	2.55	.58	3.20	.77	.65	11.25	2.42	.51	3.27	.69	.85	12.78
5	68	3.18	.78	3.85	.99	.67	7.82	2.97	.58	3.82	.91	.85	8.80
6	35	3.62	.76	4.55	1.13	.93	6.73	3.36	.65	4.47	1.19	1.11	6.47
9[b]	116	6.52	.87	9.09	1.94	2.57	17.96						

[a] All t ratios are significant beyond .001.

[b] Grade 9 was tested on the Iowa Silent Reading Test for which total pre-test and post-test are reported.

For the high school students total pre- and post-scores on the Iowa Silent Reading Test were available. Except for three students from grade 10, data from high school students beginning in the program in 1970 were all from ninth graders. Consequently, the analysis of the Iowa Silent Reading Test is limited to ninth graders. The findings for grades two through six, and grade nine are reported in Table 5.

It will be noted that all the gains reported in Table 5 are highly significant. It is, however, important to consider the gains from a substantive point of view. In grades 2 – 6 the gains in Word Knowledge range from .55 to .93. The gains in Paragraph Meaning range from .84 to 1.11. These gains exceed, in each instance on standard deviation. Thus, a substantial gain is noted at each grade and for each subtest. It will be noted also, that in general the standard deviations of the post-tests are larger than those of the pre-tests. This indicates that at the end of the year the groups tend to be somewhat more heterogeneous as compared to their performance in the beginning of the year.

In grade 9, the difference between the pre-test mean and the post-test mean (2.57) represents a gain exceeding one and one half standard deviations. Needless to say, this is a very substantial gain. In this grade the heterogeneity of the post-test scores as compared to the pre-test scores is even more pronounced than in the elementary grades.

Although meaningful and substantial gains were reported in the areas under study, it is important to note that in all instances the classes were still quite deficient in reading as all grades tested are still below the norm. This, of course, indicates a need for further remediation in order to close the gap and enable the students to derive greater benefits from their educational experience.

Despite attempts to equate schools conducting two-day programs with those of five-day programs, it was not possible to obtain a sufficiently large sample to warrant an analysis. It was felt that the use of insufficient data may lead to misinterpretations. Consequently, it was decided not to perform the analysis. The only way to insure an appropriate comparison between the two programs is to include it in the initial design in future years.

Evaluation by Classroom Teacher

The classroom teacher was asked to rate 5 items on a 7-point scale with 4 being average improvement. Five hundred and forty-nine pupil evaluation forms were returned to the evaluation team. The means and standard deviations of the ratings in the five areas are reported in Table 6.

TABLE 6

CLASSROOM TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF PUPILS
N = 549

	Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
1.	Reading ability	4.09	1.69	541
2.	Other school subjects	3.91	1.64	546
3.	Study habits	3.74	1.72	546
4.	Responsibility for outside assignments	3.91	1.77	546
5.	Attitudes toward school	4.33	1.80	546

[a]Number of responses to a given area

As can be seen in Table 6, the classroom teachers' evaluation of the pupils indicates about average gains in the five areas. It is to be noted, however, that the standard deviations are relatively large, indicating a good deal of variability in improvement among the students.

In an effort to study whether perceived gains in one area are associated with perceived gains in other areas, the ratings in the five areas were intercorrelated. The correlation matrix is reported in Table 7.

TABLE 7

CLASSROOM TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF PUPILS
INTERCORRELATION MATRIX
N = 549

Item	2	3	4	5
1. Reading Ability	.78 (538)	.71 (538)	.66 (538)	.63 (538)
2. Other School Subjects	—	.84 (544)	.77 (544)	.72 (544)
3. Study Habits	—	—	.84 (545)	.80 (545)
4. Responsibility for Outside Assignments	—	—	—	.82 (546)
5. Attitudes Toward School	—	—	—	—

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses are the sizes of the groups rated.

The high correlations among the ratings, ranging from .63 to .84, indicate that improvement, or perceived improvement, in one area was strongly associated with improvements in the other areas.

Of the 549 pupils rated, 298 are males and 251 females. In order to note whether sex is related to perceived improvements, correlations between sex and the five areas were calculated. These correlations were practically zero (they ranged from .01 to .07), indicating that there is no relationship between sex and improvement in any of the areas under consideration.

Self-Evaluation by Secondary School Pupils

This pupil questionnaire was administered (read orally) by either a member of the evaluation team or the corrective reading teacher in schools in which pupils in grades 7 – 8 participated in the program. One hundred and thirteen pupils responded to six questions designed to elicit general impressions and evaluations of some specific areas related to the program.

Table 8 reports the background characteristics of those secondary school pupils who responded to the questionnaire.

TABLE 8

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF PUPILS
N = 113

Item	Category	Frequency	Percent
Grade	7	87	77
	8	24	21
	No Response	2	2
Sex	Male	58	51
	Female	53	47
	No Response	2	2
Language Spoken at Home	English	37	33
	Other	76	67

About as many boys as girls responded to the questionnaire (51 percent and 47 percent respectively). One third of the respondents indicated that English is the language spoken in their homes.

The responses to the six questions of the questionnaire are summarized in Table 9.

TABLE 9

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE
GRADES 7 – 8
N = 113

		Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	Do you feel that going to the special reading class has helped you to improve your reading?	Yes	96	85
		Not Sure	14	12
		No	3	3
2.	Do you feel that you have improved in your other school subjects as a result of your being in the reading program?	Yes	73	65
		Not Sure	25	22
		No	15	13
3.	Do you like to read more outside of school than you did before going to the reading class?	Yes	71	63
		Not Sure	16	14
		No	26	23
4.	Has going to the reading class helped you to study better?	Yes	69	61
		Not Sure	26	23
		No	18	16
5.	Did you participate in a similar reading program last year (1969-1970)?	Yes	91	80
		Not Sure	3	3
		No	19	17
6.	Would you like to participate in a reading program again next year?	Yes	59	52
		Not Sure	26	23
		No	24	21
		No Response	4	4

The general pattern that emerges from the responses to the questionnaire is that the pupils found the experience in the reading program meaningful. In each instance more than 50 percent answered in the affirmative to questions which attempted to assess the manner in which the program was perceived by the students.

The percent of "Yes" responses ranged from 52 to 85, the latter being a response to a question whether participation in the reading program has helped the pupil to improve his

reading (item 1). It should be further noted that the percent of "No" responses was low in all cases, ranging from 3 (item 1) to 23 (item 3).

In sum, then, the majority of the pupils responding to the questionnaire viewed the program favorably.

Evaluation of In-Service Training

The major objectives of the in-service training program for 1970-71 were reported by the project coordinator to be (1) individualizing instruction; (2) fostering and guiding parent participation; (3) eliciting the cooperation of the non-public school staff; (4) refining the teaching skills of the corrective reading teacher (CRT) in the diagnosis and treatment of reading disabilities; (5) encouraging the professional growth of the corrective reading teachers. To meet these objectives a program consisting of large group meetings, small group workshops, and field visits was instituted. In addition, orientation sessions for teachers new to the program focused on pupil selection, diagnosis, methods and materials of instruction, administrative procedures, and professional ethics.

A total of 3,003 hours were devoted to teacher training. Three three-hour orientation sessions, seven five-hour large group conferences, thirty-four small group workshops (approximately 2 hours per session), and 1,297 field visits by the coordinator and the field supervisors were conducted during the 1970-71 school year. It is important to note, however, that there were variations in the number and type of meetings attended by the reading teachers (see Table 10 below).

A questionnaire consisting of questions pertaining to attendance at in-service training sessions as well as specific questions relating to the adequacy and relevance of the training sessions was mailed to all reading teachers. Ninety-seven questionnaires were returned to the evaluation team. The frequency of attendance at the training sessions as well as general impressions of the teachers are summarized in Table 10. Only twenty respondents attended orientation sessions for new teachers. The remaining teachers were involved in the program in earlier years. Despite the variations in the number and type of meetings attended, 75 percent of all respondents maintained that the amount of in-service training sessions was sufficient (item 3). Seventy-five teachers indicated that they had participated in last year's in-service training sessions. Of these 75 teachers, 69 percent considered this year's sessions about as equal in effectiveness to last year's sessions. Nine percent considered this year's sessions inferior, while 21 percent considered them superior, as compared to last year's sessions.

TABLE 10

IN-SERVICE TRAINING SESSIONS FREQUENCIES OF ATTENDANCE AND GENERAL IMPRESSIONS
N = 97

Question	Category	Frequency	Percent
1. Number of orientation sessions attended	3 – 5	16	80
	6+	4	20
2. Number of Hours – orientation sessions	5 – 9	13	65
	10+	7	35
3. Number of Large Group Conferences attended (25 or more participants)	1	12	12
	2	16	17
	3	28	29
	4	11	11
	5	10	10
	6	5	5
	7+	8	8
	No Response	7	7
4. Number of Hours – Large Group Conferences	1 – 5	10	10
	6 – 10	16	17
	11 – 15	27	28
	16 – 20	11	11
	21 – 25	7	7
	26+	16	17
	No Response	10	10
5. Number of Small Group Workshops attended (less than 25 participants)	1	33	34
	2	19	20
	3	10	10
	4+	19	19
	No Response	16	17
6. Number of Hours – Small Group Workshops	1 – 3	34	35
	4 – 6	25	26
	8 – 10	5	5
	11+	17	18
	No Response		
7. In your opinion, was the amount of in-service training sufficient?	Yes	73	75
	No	16	17
	No Response	8	8
8. Did you participate in the corrective reading program last year?	Yes	78	80
	No	17	18
	No Response	2	2
9. Did you participate in the in-service training last year?	Yes	75	77
	No	22	23
10. In comparison to last year's sessions, this year's sessions were, on the whole:	Inferior	7	9
	About the Same	52	69
	Superior	16	21

In addition to the above information and general impressions, the teachers were asked to address themselves to six specific areas which dealt with the content received during the training sessions. The respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point scale the degree to which the training they have received in each area was relevant to their work as corrective reading teachers. The results are summarized in Table 11.

TABLE 11

EVALUATION OF TRAINING SESSIONS
CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS
N = 97

	Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
a.	Specific procedures for diagnosis	3.80	1.18	88
b.	Methods of corrective instruction	3.56	1.21	89
c.	Use of instructional materials	3.66	1.13	87
d.	Procedures for pupil evaluation	3.62	1.11	91
e.	Methods of individualizing instruction	3.70	1.24	88
f.	Techniques for parent involvement	3.32	1.25	83

[a]Number of teachers responding to a given item.

The overall ratings are generally favorable. The area rated highest (mean = 3.80) is the one dealing with specific procedures for diagnosis (item 1). The area rated lowest is the one dealing with techniques for parents involvement (mean = 3.32. Item f).

Although the majority of the teachers felt that the training sessions were sufficient and that the coverage of various specific areas was relevant to their work experience some suggestions for the improvement of the in-service training did emerge.

The major suggestion involves additional small group meetings to be held by individual supervisors or by district. It is suggested by the reading teachers that these meetings be a workshop or seminar type and be used primarily to discuss common problems, exchange information on specific methods and materials, share ideas, and as an informal question and answer period. Additional suggestions include (1) Greater involvement of reading teacher in the planning and implementation of the training sessions; (2) Guest lectures by reading

specialists outside of the New York City Board of Education; (3) Opportunities to observe experienced reading teachers and to visit other reading programs; (4) Demonstration lessons using children to observe specific diagnostic procedures and techniques for individualizing instruction; (5) Additional discussion of innovative materials and viewing samples of available materials; (6) Orientation sessions to emphasize diagnostic and instructional techniques rather than administrative and clerical procedures; (7) Guidance as to relevant college courses and programs to advance professional growth of the reading teachers.

Staff Evaluation of the Program

Questionnaires for the evaluation of the reading program were mailed to corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, and principals, in all of the non-public schools participating in the program. The field supervisors' evaluation of the program was elicited during an interview. The respondents were asked to rate various aspects of the program on a five-point scale from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory."

In addition to the rating scales, corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, and principals who had participated in previous Title I ESEA reading programs were asked to compare this year's program with last year's program. Participants were also asked whether they would be interested in participating in a similar program again. It was hoped in this way to assess the general degree of satisfaction of the professional staff with the program. Respondents were also urged to make comments and recommendations that they wished to make, thus covering aspects that may have been overlooked in the rating scale. An analysis of these data follows:

Reading Teachers

A total of 97 corrective reading teachers rated fifteen aspects of the program. The means and standard deviations for each item are reported in Table 12.

In general, the reading teachers' evaluation of the program is favorable. Thirteen areas were rated above "Average." One area – parental involvement – was rated slightly below "Average" (mean = 2.84. Item o.). Areas with ratings greater than 4 were: 1) Materials (item f), 2) Cooperation of school personnel (item m), and 3) Supervision of program (item n).

TABLE 12

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS

	Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
a.	Selection procedures for pupils in the corrective reading program.	3.99	1.04	93
b.	Physical facilities provided by the school.	3.50	1.32	94
c.	Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.	3.26	1.18	94
d.	Number of pupils in each group.	3.37	1.36	96
e.	Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading.	3.94	1.07	94
f.	Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program.	4.20	.99	96
g.	Individualization of instruction to meet pupil needs.	3.83	1.04	95
h.	Use of Informal Textbooks Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading.	3.78	1.19	86
i.	Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading.	3.30	1.01	92
j.	Use of Gray Oral Reading Test.	3.34	1.16	94
k.	Communication between classroom teacher and yourself.	3.92	1.06	93
l.	Reinforcement of reading program activities in the home classroom.	3.01	.98	88
jm.	Cooperation of school personnel	4.21	1.13	95
n.	Supervision of program by reading supervisors and reading coordinator.	4.08	1.17	95
o.	Involvement of parents through individual and/or group conferences and other techniques.	2.84	1.07	94

[a]Number of Respondents in a given area.

Comments made by the reading teachers reflect their concerns in areas involving number of pupils, use of the Metropolitan Reading Test, and materials. A sampling of comments in these areas follows:

> "I think that because the program is committed so firmly to those guidelines under which it was funded, it cannot be flexible enough to meet the real needs of these children. We are bound to a group of ten, for one hour, when this might not at all be the best arrangement."

> "The basic format of ten children twice a week for one hour is inadequate. The children should be seen more often and in smaller groups."

> "I have some reservations about the validity of the Metropolitan for my groups which are bilingual (largely). Hence, there are some cultural differences which I think put them at a disadvantage. There are also difficulties connected with the structure of English which also puts them at a disadvantage."

> "The program is highly satisfactory – there is enough latitude to allow for originality to meet individual needs. The distressing aspect is the use of tests like *Metropolitan* which really does not test inner city children with language backgrounds and speech patterns which vary so widely."

> "Teachers should be able to choose some of their own materials. Some of the literature provided is highly inappropriate for urban disadvantaged children."

> "The materials are wonderful – especially the pleasure reading paperbacks. However, I would prefer a system whereby I could order materials I really need rather than receiving materials I seldom use."

Needless to say the above comments are not representative of the total Title I staff.

A sampling of other comments indicating the general satisfaction with the program as reflected by the ratings, especially in the emphasis on individualizing instruction follows:

> "The emphasis on individualization has been extremely effective in giving each child the proper attention he deserves plus training him in independent work habits."

"We have individualized instruction this year. The children and I feel more gratified. They really enjoy selecting their own material. I think this program is encouraging many to read more."

"I feel that the program is commendable in that it is concentrating its efforts upon individualized instruction based on the needs and interest of the child."

"On the whole I think this program is extremely effective, as I can see progress in reading in the majority of the cases."

"Improvement of attitude towards reading was very rewarding in many cases."

The responses of the reading teachers to the questions pertaining to their participation in the program, overall impressions, and interest in future participation in the program are summarized in Table 13.

TABLE 13

PARTICIPATION AND GENERAL IMPRESSIONS
CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS
N = 97

		Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	Did you participate in the training sessions?	Yes	90	93
		No	3	3
		No Response	4	4
2.	Did you participate in this program last year?	Yes	78	80
		No	15	15
		No Response	3	3
3.	Did you participate in this school or in another school?	This School	64	82
		Another School	14	18
4.	What is your overall impression when you compare this year's program with last year's program? This year's program is:	Inferior	3	4
		About the Same	38	48
		Superior	37	47
5.	Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?	Yes	88	81
		Not Sure	7	7
		No response	2	2

Ninety-three percent of the respondents indicated that they had participated in the training program. Seventy-eight teachers indicated that they had participated in the reading program last year. Eighty-two percent of those participating in last year's program did so in the same school. Comparing last year's program with this year's program, 38 teachers thought that the two were about the same, 37 considered this year's program superior, while three teachers considered this year's program inferior.

An overwhelming majority of the teachers (91 percent) indicated that they are interested in participating in next year's program. It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that the teachers were generally satisfied with their experiences in the corrective reading program.

Classroom Teachers

The principal in each of the 158 non-public schools was supplied with a sufficient number of Classroom Teacher Questionnaires to distribute to those classroom teachers whose students participated in the reading program. Five hundred and seventeen responses were returned to the evaluation team.

The teachers were asked to rate five aspects of the program on a five-point rating scale, from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory." The results are summarized in Table 14.

TABLE 14

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM
CLASSROOM TEACHERS
N = 517

Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
a. Selection procedures for pupils in corrective reading program.	3.55	1.14	504
b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.	3.49	1.18	504
c. Services of the reading teacher.	4.05	1.07	500
d. Communication between reading teacher and yourself.	3.62	1.31	505
e. Application of regular classroom activities in the reading program.	3.15	1.19	484

[a]Number of respondents to a given area.

All areas were rated as being above average. The services of the reading teachers received the highest rating (mean = 4.05). It is interesting to note that the reading teachers gave a somewhat higher rating than did the classroom teachers to the item dealing with the communication between reading teachers and classroom teachers. (Reading teachers' mean = 3.92. Classroom teachers' mean = 3.62). Both groups thought that the application of regular classroom activities in the reading program was about average.

The classroom teachers were asked to compare this year's program with last year's program, as well as indicate whether or not they are interested in their students participating next year in a similar program. The classroom teachers' responses to these questions are summarized in Table 15.

TABLE 15

PUPIL PARTICIPATION AND GENERAL IMPRESSIONS
CLASSROOM TEACHERS
N = 517

	Question	Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	Did your pupils participate in this program last year?	Yes	412	80
		No	67	13
		No Response	38	7
2.	How would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole, this year's program is:	Inferior	15	4
		About the Same	276	67
		Superior	56	13
		No Response	65	16
3.	Would you be interested in your pupils participating in a similar program next year?	Yes	403	78
		Not Sure	60	12
		No	26	5
		No Response	28	5

Eighty percent of the teachers indicated that their students participated in last year's program. Of these 80 percent (412 teachers), 67 percent thought that this year's program was about the same as last year's program. Thirteen percent considered this year's program superior, while 4 percent considered it inferior. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers indicated an interest in their students' participation in a similar program next year. This response and the others discussed above indicate that the classroom teachers consider the program useful and that it needs to be continued.

The generally favorable responses of the classroom teachers to the reading program may be noted in a sampling of teacher's comments.

"The Reading Program seems excellent in its individualized work. The children in my class need this very badly, and they enjoy the program."

"There has been a great improvement in children that could never have achieved without the individualized program geared to each child's need."

"I suggest that there be more communication between class teacher and reading teacher. I think our teachers this year have been both interested and diligent. They were experienced and experience shows in the work they seem to have accomplished."

"Our corrective reading teacher is aware of the individual reading problems of each child and seems to stress individualized remedial work."

Principals

The principals in all of the non-public schools receiving corrective reading services were asked to rate nine areas pertaining to the program. Ninety-three principals responded to the questionnaire. In Table 16 are reported the means and standard deviations of the principals' evaluations of the seven areas.

The only item to receive a "below average" rating is the one dealing with involvement of parents (item i, mean = 2.55). While consistent with the rating given this item by the corrective reading teachers, it is to be noted that the mean rating of the principals is even lower than the mean rating of the reading teachers. Consequently, there is little doubt that the area of parent involvement leaves a good deal to be desired.

All other items received above average ratings. Three items received ratings above "four". These were: 1) services of the reading teachers (4.13), 2) materials supplied (4.13), and 3) cooperation of reading teacher with school personnel (4.24).

As additional indicators of their assessment of the program, principals were asked to compare this year's program to last year's program as well as state whether they would be interested in participating in a similar program next year. Their responses are summarized in Table 17.

TABLE 16
EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM PRINCIPALS
N = 93

	Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
a.	Selection procedures for the corrective reading program.	3.46	1.18	93
b.	Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.	3.10	1.33	93
c.	Individualization of program to meet school scheduling problems.	3.28	1.32	93
d.	Services of the reading teacher.	4.13	.98	93
e.	Materials supplied for the program.	4.13	.88	93
f.	Reinforcement of reading activities in the home classroom.	3.18	.92	93
g.	On-going supervision by reading supervisors and reading coordinator.	3.75	.96	91
h.	Cooperation of reading teacher with school personnel.	4.24	.97	93
i.	Involvement of parents.	2.55	.96	92

[a]Number of respondents to a given area

TABLE 17
GENERAL IMPRESSION AND INTEREST PRINCIPALS
N = 93

	Question	Category	Frequency	Percent
1.	If your school participated in last year's program, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's. On the whole, this year's program is:	Inferior	–	–
		About the Same	66	76
		Superior	21	24
2.	Would you be interested in your school participating in a similar program next year?	Yes	85	92
		Not Sure	4	4
		No	4	4

Seventy-six percent of the principals thought this year's program was "about the same" as last year's while 24 percent considered this year's program superior. No one thought that this year's program was inferior. As to interest in participation – 92 percent indicated an interest in participating next year, 4 percent were not sure, and 4 percent are not interested in participating.

A sampling of principals' comments reflect their general attitude toward the program.

> "The program is very beneficial but I would like to see more coordination between the school reading program and the corrective reading."
>
> "The teacher should be able to select materials suited to the child. Reading should be available every day for the children, twice a week is insufficient."
>
> "We had a superior teacher this year. It is too bad that she is hampered by the legalisms which prevent her from working more closely with the classroom teacher."
>
> "I would prefer to have the reading teacher work with groups in the classroom with the teacher."
>
> "We have a unique problem in fitting the remedial reading program into our school schedule. A greater flexibility in length of remediation program periods per day is needed."
>
> "Materials (which are fantastic) could be shared more readily – students have more access to materials."
>
> "I am interested in having our children participate in a corrective program but one which would be consistent for five days and which could be worked into the schedule."
>
> "Closer team work of reading specialist with classroom teachers would be more beneficial. Sharing of materials with classroom teacher would enhance program."
>
> "The program in essence is excellent. However, greater working communication between class teacher and corrective reading is essential if program is to be truly effective. This can be accomplished by permitting the corrective reading teacher to test and grade children for their records and also by correlating her materials with those used in the schools. In this way the corrective reading teacher becomes an integral part of the school program, rather than an appendage."

The above comments and others, indicate that the principals would prefer greater flexibility in programming, a sharing of materials with the regular classrooms, and

integration of the Title I personnel with the school faculty. Although many of their suggestions might increase the effectiveness of the reading program, the federal guide-lines for aid to non-public schools do not permit the type of services being requested by some of the principls. In addition, the program as mandated is equivalent to special reading instruction provided for children in the New York City public schools.

The picture that emerges from the ratings as well as from the responses to the questions in Table 17 and comments is one of general satisfaction and interest in the program.

Project Coordinator and Field Supervisors

Eight field supervisors and the project coordinator were asked to rate, on a five-point rating scale, twelve aspects of the program during an interview conducted by the evaluation co-director. In addition, they were asked to describe the nature of the in-service training and supervision (See pp. 16 – 19). Specific strengths and weaknesses of the program were discussed with the evaluation co-director.

The rating of the field supervisors and the project coordinator are reported in Table 18. Due to the small number of responses, it was felt that a frequency of ratings of each aspect would better reflect the evaluation of the supervisors, than would means and standard deviations.

No area was rated "unsatisfactory." Several areas, however, received some "barely satisfactory" ratings. Those were: 1) Time allocation for reading services (item b, 4 ratings), 2) Number of pupils in each group (item c, 4 ratings), 3) Use of Informal Textbook (item f, 1 rating), 4) Use of Metropolitan Reading Test (item g, 3 ratings), 5) Reinforcement of reading program (item i, 3 ratings), and 6) Parents' involvement (item 3, 1 rating). The remainder of the ratings ranged from "average" to "very satisfactory." Three areas were viewed as particularly favorable. They are: 1) Selection procedures (item a), 2) Materials and instruments (item d), 3) Individualization of instruction (item j). It is important to note that the two areas rated "barely satisfactory" by four of the supervisors (time allocation and number of pupils) are mandated by the project guidelines and are not under the control of the project coordinator or field supervisors.

All of the field supervisors indicated that this year's program was more effective than the previous year's program. Among the reasons given were the increased emphasis on individualization, the greater availability of trade books, and the increased experience of the reading teachers. The program's strengths are based on its stable teaching and supervisory

TABLE 18

EVALUATION OF READING PROGRAM
SUPERVISORS AND PROJECT COORDINATOR
N = 9

		Frequency				
		Unsatisfactory	Barely Satisfactory	Average	Above Average	Very Satisfactory
a.	Selection procedures of pupils for the corrective reading	–	–	3	–	5 (pc)[a]
b.	Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading services	–	4	2 (pc)	1	1
c.	Number of pupils in each group	–	3 (pc)	2	1	2
d.	Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading	–	–	1	1	6 (pc)
e.	Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program	–	–	–	–	8 (pc)
f.	Use of Informal Textbook test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading	–	1	2	2	3 (pc)
g.	Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading	–	2 (pc)	2	2	2
h.	Use of Gray Oral Reading Test	–	–	4	3	1 (pc)
i.	Reinforcement of reading program activities in home classroom	–	3	3	2 (pc)	–
j.	Individualization of instruction to meet pupil needs	–	–	–	4 (pc)	4
k.	Cooperation of school personnel	–	–	5	1 (pc)	2
l.	Involvement of parents through individual and/or group conferences and other techniques	–	(pc)	5	2	1

[a](pcs) indicates ratings given by the project coordinator

staff, excellent and varied materials, and an on-going teacher training program. The stress on individualization of instruction to meet specific pupil needs was considered by the field supervisors as an added asset to the program this year. The only weakness mentioned was the lack of a central depository for materials which would facilitate the supply of needed materials to the reading teachers.

Parents' Reactions to Program

It was desired to assess the degree of parental involvement in the program and their reaction to the program. For this purpose, a letter and brief questionnaire were disbributed to pupils in corrective reading classes to give to their parents. The letter and questionnaire, in English and Spanish, were distributed to approximately 2,200 children in thirty schools which were selected by the liaison officers to represent various ethnic groups and neighborhoods in the city.

The questionnaire attempted to determine the amount of parental involvement through attendance at workshops, group meetings, and individual parent-teacher conferences. In addition, parents responded to two questions which were designed to ascertain their reaction to the reading program itself. A total of 345 questionnaires were returned by mail to the evaluation team. Of the 345 responses, 144 were in Spanish.

The responses are reported in Table 19. It is first of all important to note that only 16 percent of the parents responded to the questionnaire.

Only 14 percent of the parents attended workshops. Of the fifty parents in this group, 32 attended one or two sessions, and 13 attended three or more sessions. All fifty indicated that the workshops were useful. Of those who did not attend (286), 28 percent gave the reason as being at work, 45 percent said they were not invited, 24 percent gave other reasons for nonattendance. In view of the fact, that 45 percent of those not attending any workshops indicated that they were not invited, it is reasonable to assume that at least some of them might have come had they been invited.

One hundred and fifty-three parents (44 percent) indicated that they had individual conferences with the reading teachers. The frequency of such conferences ranged mostly from one to three (78 percent). Only 14 percent attended group meetings with the reading teacher. Eighty percent of the parents thought the program was useful to their children, while two parents only thought it was not useful. When asked whether they would want their children to participate in next year's program, 81 percent of the parents responded in the affirmative, 11 percent were not sure, and 6 percent did not want their child in next year's program.

TABLE 19

PARENTS' RESPONSES
N = 345

Question	Category	Frequency	Percent
1. Did you attend any parent workshops?	Yes	50	14
	No	286	83
	No Response	9	3
2. How many parent workshops did you attend?	1	14	28
	2	18	36
	3+	13	26
	No Response	5	10
3. Did you find the workshops useful?	Yes	50	100
4. If you did not attend, give the reason:	a. At work when workshop was held	81	28
	b. Not invited	128	45
	c. Other reasons	68	24
	d. No response	9	3
5. Did you have any individual conferences with the reading teacher?	Yes	153	44
	No	187	54
	No Response	5	2
5a. If yes, approximately how many?	1	71	46
	2	34	22
	3	16	10
	4	10	7
	5+	9	6
	No Response	13	9
6. Did you attend any group meetings with the reading teacher and other parents?	Yes	48	14
	No	288	83
	No Response	9	3
6a. If yes, how many?	1	15	31
	2	13	27
	3+	12	25
	No Response	8	17
7. Do you think the special reading program was helpful to your child?	Yes	275	80
	Not Sure	52	15
	No	2	–
	No Response	16	5
8. Would you want your child to be in the reading program again next year?	Yes	281	81
	Not Sure	37	11
	No	21	6
	No Response	6	2

The overall impression from the parents' responses is that while there was little involvement on their part, at least as far as communication with school personnel, the overwhelming majority of the respondents found the program useful and wanted its continuation.

A sampling of parents' comments reflect their overall favorable attitude and reactions to the program.

> "My son has shown a big improvement. He seems to want to read better. He reads a lot at home without my asking."

> "Yo se que mi hijo le ayudo mucho en el programo de lecturo pues eyo casi no sabea leer y ahora se la posa leyendo en libros."

> "Although I've never attended any of the workshops, I would like very much for my son to be in the reading program next year. If invited next year I will make it a point to attend"

> "Este programa es de gran interes para mi hijo, por la practica que le ayuda en su estudio."

All the above remarks apply to those parents who responded to the questionnaire. It is impossible to make any generalization to the other parents who have not responded.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The New York City Board of Education under Title I ESEA has instituted corrective reading services for disadvantaged pupils in non-public schools who are deficient in reading. The program is organized so that small groups of pupils meet with the Title I Reading Teachers to receive specialized instruction based on a diagnosis of reading disabilities. This program is in its fifth full year of operation.

The major objectives of the program are (1) to increase proficiency in reading; (2) to increase general achievement and stimulate motivation for school work by improving reading skills; (3) to note the effect of an experimental five-day a week reading program on reading achievement as compared to the regular two-day a week program; (4) to make the corrective reading work more effective by reinforcement of reading work in the regular classroom and by encouraging parents to participate in the pupils' reading program.

Formal evaluation of the 1970-71 school year program began in early January. The evaluation focused on the degree to which the objectives noted above were met. Evaluation

procedures included site visits to a stratified sample of 28 schools selected from the 158 participating schools; an analysis of reading test scores for a random sample of 400 elementary school pupils and 116 secondary school pupils; and an analysis of responses by the professional staff, parents and pupils to detailed questionnaires and rating scales designed to assess their perceptions and reactions to the program.

This final report includes an evaluation of the project's implementation, an assessment of the project's effectiveness in increasing reading achievement, an evaluation of the in-service training as perceived by the reading teachers, and an evaluation of the program by the professional staff, the parents, and the pupils who participated in the program. This report is restricted to the operations of the program during the 1970-71 school year.

Analysis of the data collected yielded the following findings:

1. Observation of the program in operation in a stratified sample of 28 schools indicated that the program was implemented as outlined in the project proposal. Observers noted that the program at both the elementary and secondary levels was functioning satisfactorily.

2. Mean ratings of the 28 schools in respect to their physical facilities, materials, evaluation, planning, teaching procedures, teacher behavior, and pupil participation were all above average. Physical facilities showed the greatest variability across schools and the lowest correlations with the other six aspects rated.

3. Analysis of reading test scores indicated meaningful and substantial gains in the areas under study. In each instance the mean gains exceeded one standard deviation. It is to be noted, however, that in all instances the classes were quite deficient in reading and therefore despite the impressive gains all grades tested are still below the norm. This, of course, indicates a need for further remediation in order to close the gap and enable the students to derive greater benefits from their educational experience.

4. Ratings by the classroom teachers of their pupils who attended the reading program indicated "average improvement" in reading ability, other school subjects, study habits, outside assignments, and attitude toward school. There was, however, a good deal of variability in improvement among students.

5. Self-evaluation by secondary school pupils showed positive reactions to the program. A relatively large number (59 percent) indicated that they wished to participate in a similar program next year.

6. Reading teachers (75 percent of respondents) reported that the in-service training they received was sufficient. The content covered during the training sessions was considered

relevant to their work as corrective reading teachers.

7. Principals and classroom teachers in the non-public schools favorably evaluated the program. The only item rated below average was the involvement of parents. An overwhelming majority of the teachers (78 percent) and the principals (92 percent) expressed interest in participating in a similar program next year.

8. The Title I staff including the project coordinator, field supervisors, and corrective reading teachers reported positive reactions to the various aspects of the program. With the exception of parental involvement all aspects of the program were rated above average by the reading teachers.

9. Parents' responses indicated that while there was little involvement on their part, at least as far as communication with school personnel, the overwhelming majority (81 percent) found the program useful and wanted its continuation.

In conclusion, on the basis of site observations, analysis of reading test data, reactions of the professional staff, parents, and pupils, and additional data cited in the body of the report, the evaluators consider the corrective reading program effective in accomplishing its major goals. It is, therefore, recommended that the corrective reading services for disadvantaged pupils in non-public schools be recycled.

Some recommendations which might increase the effectiveness of the program follow:

1. Urge non-public school principals to upgrade those physical facilities that are inadequate.

2. Set up a central depository for reading materials to facilitate their distribution and to enable the reading teachers to view and select materials geared to their pupils' needs.

3. Encourage the use of teacher-made materials by conducting teacher workshops in which the reading teachers would prepare and share these materials.

4. Increase the number of informal small group meetings for in-service training.

5. Consider involving the reading teachers in the planning and implementation of the training sessions.

6. Include guest lectures who are reading specialists to enrich the in-service training program.

7. Continue to stress individual diagnosis of errors and an instructional program geared to correct the deficiences of each pupil.

8. Increase, where possible, communication between the classroom teacher and the reading teacher.

9. Continue to work in the area of parental involvement, particularly in the setting up of parent workshops.

10. Study the possibility of using a test instrument other than the Metropolitan Reading Test to assess pupil progress.

APPENDIX A

Observer Check List

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Observer Check List

School _____ **Grade** _____ **Group** _____

CRT _____ **Number Boys** _____ **Girls** _____

Observer _____ **Date** _____

	Yes	No
A. Physical Facilities		
1. Separate area for reading program	_____	_____
2. Size of area adequate	_____	_____
3. Space available for small group work	_____	_____
4. Space available for individual work	_____	_____
5. Storage facilities adequate	_____	_____
6. Chalkboard available	_____	_____
7. Area attractive	_____	_____
8. Adequate physical provisions (lights, ventilation, etc.)	_____	_____
Overall Rating of Facilities	1 2 3 4 5	
B. Materials		
1. Variety of commercial materials being used.		
a. Workbooks	_____	_____
b. Trade books	_____	_____
c. Magazines	_____	_____
d. Newspapers	_____	_____
e. Content-area materials	_____	_____
f. Other	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
2. Teacher-made materials	_____	_____
3. Audio-visual aids	_____	_____
4. Interest level appropriate to age and maturity of pupils	_____	_____
5. Levels of materials suitable for reading ability of pupils	_____	_____
6. Differentiation between instructional level and independent level materials	_____	_____
7. Attractive in appearance	_____	_____
8. Sufficient quantity	_____	_____
Overall Rating of Materials	1 2 3 4 5	

	Yes	No
C. Evaluation		
1. Use of Informal Reading Inventory	_____	_____
2. Use of Gray Oral Reading Test	_____	_____
3. Standardized Reading Test upon admission to program	_____	_____
4. Standardized Reading Test at end of school year	_____	_____
5. On-going informal evaluation of errors in word recognition	_____	_____
6. On-going diagnosis of errors in comprehension	_____	_____
7. Evaluation of deficiencies in study skills	_____	_____
Overall Rating of Evaluation	1 2 3 4 5	
D. Planning		
1. Evidence of planned sequence in skill development	_____	_____
2. Planning of skill lessons based on on-going diagnosis of deficiencies	_____	_____
3. Evidence of planned varied activities for individual and small group needs	_____	_____
4. Application materials and assignments differentiated differentiated for individual and group	_____	_____
Overall Rating of Planning	1 2 3 4 5	
E. Teaching Procedures		
1. Background, readiness, or concept building where appropriate to lesson	_____	_____
2. Specific skill teaching in		
a. word recognition	_____	_____
b. comprehension	_____	_____
c. study skills	_____	_____
3. Appropriate application following development of a specific skill	_____	_____
4. Questions differentiated to include various types of meanings – literal, interpretation, critical evaluation	_____	_____
5. Grouping of pupils (small group or individual) for special needs	_____	_____
6. Procedures appropriate to maturity and ability of pupils	_____	_____
7. Use of class time – pacing, variety of activities	_____	_____
8. Integration of reading with content areas	_____	_____
Overall Rating of Teaching Procedures	1 2 3 4 5	

	Yes	No
F. Teacher Behavior		
1. Appears enthusiastic	_____	_____
2. Establishes a good rapport with pupils (relaxed, informal, confident)	_____	_____
3. Encourages all pupils to participate	_____	_____
4. Instills confidence in pupils – uses positive reinforcement	_____	_____
Overall Rating of the Teacher	1 2 3 4 5	
G. Pupil Participation		
1. Arrive promptly for reading instruction	_____	_____
2. Actively responds during reading period	_____	_____
3. Interact with each other	_____	_____
4. Show interest in independent reading	_____	_____
Overall Rating of Pupil Interest in program	1 2 3 4 5	

Observer's Comments

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

Pupil Evaluation

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Evaluation – Title I Project
Dr. Leonore Ringler – New York University

Pupil Evaluation

School _____ **Date** _____

Pupil _____ **Boy** _____ **Girl** _____

Classroom Teacher _____ **Reading Teacher** _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Based on your observation of those pupils who attended the corrective reading program, indicate your general impression of the pupils in the following areas:

a. Reading ability

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable gain			Average improvement			Gained a great deal

b. Other school subjects

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable gain			Average improvement			Gained a great deal

c. Study habits

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable improvement			Average improvement			Improved a great deal

d. Responsibility for outside assignments

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable improvement			Average improvement			Improved a great deal

e. Attitude toward school

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable improvement			Average improvement			Improved a great deal

APPENDIX C

Pupil Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Pupil Questionnaire

School _____ **Grade** _____

Reading Teacher _____ **Today's Date** _____

Pupil's Name _____ **Boy** _____ **Girl** _____

Date of Birth _____
Mo. **Year**

Language Spoken at Home _____

---

1. Do you feel that going to the special reading class has helped you to improve your reading?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

2. Do you feel that you have improved in your other school subjects as a result of your being in the reading program?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

3. Do you like to read more outside of school than you did before going to the reading class?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

4. Has going to the reading class helped you to study better?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

5. Did you participate in a similar reading program last year (1969-70)?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

6. Would you like to participate in a reading program again next year?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

APPENDIX D

Corrective Reading Teacher In-Service Training Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Corrective Reading Teacher In-Service Training Questionnaire

School _____ **Grade** _____

Reading Teacher _____ **Date** _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

---

1. For each type of in-service training noted below, indicate the number of sessions and hours that you attended. Respond to item *a* only if your appointment to the Title I reading teacher position was effective this year (1970-1971).

Type of In-Service Training	Number of Sessions	Number of Hours
a. Orientation Program for new teachers	_____	_____
b. Large Group Meetings (25 or more participants)	_____	_____
c. Small Group Meetings (less than 25 participants)	_____	_____

2. If you did not attend any training sessions, note the type (a, b, or c above) and state the reason.

_____

_____

_____

3. In your opinion, was the amount of in-service training sufficient?

Yes _____ No _____

4. Did you participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year (1969-1970)?

Yes _____ No _____

5. Did you participate in the in-service training last year?

Yes _____ No _____

6. If your answer to question 5 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's sessions in comparison to last year's sessions?

On the whole this year's training sessions were:

a. Inferior _____

b. About the same _____

c. Superior _____

Instructions: Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the training sessions. Use the following system to evaluate the relevancy of the information received to your experience in teaching corrective reading. If you think the information received was very satisfactory put a 5 in the space provided before the topic. If you think the information received was above average, put a 4 before it. Use the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1, similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the numbers so that 1 would mean unsatisfactory. For any item that was not covered during the training session, write NC (Not Covered) in the space provided for the ratings.

Rating

_____ a. Specific procedures for diagnosis

_____ b. Methods of corrective instruction

_____ c. Use of instructional materials

_____ d. Procedures for pupil evaluation

_____ e. Methods of individualizing instruction

_____ f. Techniques for parent involvement

Suggestions for Improvement of Training Sessions:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

School _____ **Grade** _____

Reading Teacher _____ **Date** _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 15 items about the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a *5* in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers *5, 4, 3, 2,* and *1* similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that *1* would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

Rating

_____ a. Selection procedures of pupils for the corrective reading program.

_____ b. Physical facilities provided by the school.

_____ c. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.

_____ d. Number of pupils in each group.

_____ e. Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading.

_____ f. Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplies for the instructional program.

_____ g. Individualization of instruction to meet pupil needs.

_____ h. Use of Informal Textbook Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading.

_____ i. Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading.

_____ j. Use of Gray Oral Reading Test.

_____ k. Communication between classroom teacher and yourself.

_____ l. Reinforcement of reading program activities in the home classroom.

_____ m. Cooperation of school personnel.

_____ n. Supervision of program by reading supervisors and reading coordinator.

_____ o. Involvement of parents through individual and/or group conferences and other techniques.

1. Did you participate in the training sessions?

   Yes _____ No _____

2. Did you participate in this program last year (1969-1970)?

   Yes _____ No _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, answer a. and b. below:

   a. Did you participate in this school? _____ or in another school? _____

   b. What is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's program is

      _____ inferior _____ about the same _____ superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX F

Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

School _____ **Grade** _____

Classroom Teacher _____ **Date** _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 5 items about the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a *5* in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers *5, 4, 3, 2,* and *1* similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that *1* would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

Rating

_____ a. Selection procedures of pupils for the corrective reading program.
_____ b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.
_____ c. Services of the reading teacher.
_____ d. Communication between the reading teacher and yourself.
_____ e. Application of regular classroom activities in the reading program.

---

1. Did your pupil's participate in this program last year (1969-1970)?

   Yes _____ No _____

2. If your answer to question 1 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole this year's program is:

   a. Inferior _____ b. about the same _____ c. superior _____

3. Would you be interested in your pupils participating in a similar program next year?

   Yes _____ No _____ Noe sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

APPENDIX G

Principal Evaluation Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Principal Evaluation Questionnaire

School _____ **Date** _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 9 items about the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a *5* in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers *5, 4, 3, 2,* and *1* similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that *1* would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
	Unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

_____ a. Selection procedures of pupils for the corrective reading program.
_____ b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.
_____ c. Individualization of program to meet school scheduling problems.
_____ d. Services of the reading teacher.
_____ e. Materials supplied for the program.
_____ f. Reinforcement of reading activities in the home classroom.
_____ g. On-going supervision by reading supervisors and reading coordinator.
_____ h. Cooperation of reading teacher with school personnel.
_____ i. Involvement of parents.

1. If your school participated in this program last year (1969-1970), how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's. On the whole, this year's program is:

   a. inferior _____ b. about the same _____ c. superior _____

2. Would you be interested in your school participating in a similar program next year?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

APPENDIX H

Reading Supervisor Interview Form

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Reading Supervisor Interview Form

School _____ **Date** _____

Reading Supervisor _____ **Grade** _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 12 items about the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a *5* in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers *5, 4, 3, 2,* and *1* similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that *1* would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

Rating

_____ a. Selection procedures of pupils for the corrective reading program.

_____ b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.

_____ c. Number of pupils in each group.

_____ d. Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading.

_____ e. Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program.

_____ f. Use of Informal Textbook Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading.

_____ g. Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading.

_____ h. Use of Gray Oral Reading Test.

_____ i. Reinforcement of reading program activities in home classroom.

_____ j. Individualization of instruction to meet pupil needs.

_____ k. Cooperation of school personnel.

_____ l. Involvement of parents through individual and/or group conferences and other techniques.

READING SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW FORM

1. Describe nature of in-service training program. (When conducted, number sessions, planning, gials, were by accomplished, special problems).

2. Describe nature of the supervision (how often, formal, informal, teacher reaction).

3. Did you supervise program last year (1969-70)? Compare effectiveness of the programs.

4. General evaluation of program – specific strengths and weaknesses.

APPENDIX I

Parent Questionnaire

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses
51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

May 15, 1971

Dear Parent:

New York University has been evaluating the special reading program that your child attends. In order to get a complete picture of the program, your opinions and suggestions are needed.

Therefore, I am enclosing a questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Your opinions and suggestions will enable the school to further improve the program for the benefit of your child. I, therefore, urge you to return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Your answers will be held in strict confidence.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Leonore Ringler

LEONORE RINGLER
Associate Professor

Enclosures:
Parent Questionnaire
Self-Addressed Envelope

n

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-1212

Mayo 15, 1971

Estimados Padres:

La Universidad de New York ha estado evaluando el programa de lectura al que su hijo (a) asiste. Con el fin de obtener un panorama completo del programa, necesitamos sus opiniones y sugerencias al respecto.

Por este motivo, adjunto un cuestionario y el sobre respectivo. Sus opiniones y sugerencias permitirán que la escuela mejore aún más el programa en beneficio de su hijo(a).

Por lo tanto les ruego enviar el cuestionario a la brevedad posible.

Sus respuestas serán estrictamente confidenciales.

Gracias por su cooperacion.

Muy Atentamente,

LEONORE RINGLER,
Profesora Asociada

Inc.

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Parent Questionnaire

School _____ **Name of Pupil** _____

Parent's Name _____ **Date** _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

---

1. Did you attent any parent workshops? Yes _____ No _____

2. How many parent workshops did you attend? _____

3. Did you find the workshops useful? Yes _____ No _____

4. If you did not attend, give the reason.
   a. at work when workshop was held _____
   b. not invited _____
   c. other reason _____

5. Did you have any individual conferences with the reading teacher?
   Yes _____ No _____
   If yes, approximately how many? _____

6. Did you attend any group meeting with the reading teacher and other parents?
   Yes _____ No _____
   If yes, how many? _____

7. Do you think the special reading program was helpful to your child?
   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

8. Would you want your child to be in the reading program again next year?
   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

Please feel free to make any comment about the program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PROGRAMA PARA EL MEJORAMIENTO DE LA LECTURA EN ESCUELAS PRIVADAS

Cuestionario Para Los Padres

Escuela _____ **Nombre del alumno** _____

Nombre del padre o de la madre _____ **Fecha** _____

POR FAVOR RECUERDE: Todas las respuestas serán estrictamente confidenciales y serán usadas solamente para evaluar el programa. Ninguna persona que no éste relacionada con la Escuela o el Departamento de Educacion tendrá acceso a esta informacion.

---

1. ¿Asistió usted a algunos de los talleres de padres? _____
2. ¿A cuántos talleres de padres asistió usted? _____
3. ¿Encontró usted útiles los talleres de padres? _____
4. Si usted no assistió, por favor indique la razón.
   a. Estaba trabajando cuando se afectuo el taller. _____
   b. No recibió invitación. _____
   c. Otra razón _____
5. ¿Tuvo usted alguna entrevista personal con la maestra de lectura?

   _____

   Si la respuesta es si, indique aproximadamente cuántas _____
6. ¿Atendió usted a alguna reunión de grupo con la maestra de lectura y otros padres?

   Si _____ No _____

   Si la respuestas es si, indique aproximadamente cuántas _____
7. ¿Cree usted que el programa especial de lectura fuó una ayuda para su hijo?

   Si _____ No _____ No esseguro _____
8. ¿Desearia usted que su hijo estuviera nuevamente en el programa de lectura el próximo ano?

   Si _____ No _____ No esseguro _____

Por favor, siéntese libre para hacer cualquier comentario acerca del programa.

_____

_____

_____

_____